

EXHIBIT 2

REPRESENTATIVE CASE TABLE 2

STATE	CASE
Alaska	<i>Kindred v. Burlington Northern R.R.</i> , 742 So.2d 155, 157 (Ala. 1999); <i>Catholic Bishop of N. Alaska v. Does 1-6</i> , 141 P.3d 719, 725 (Alaska 2006)
Arizona	<i>Doe v. Roe</i> , 955 P.2d 951, 962 (1998)
Arkansas	<i>In re Prempro Prods. Lia. Litig.</i> , 586 F.3d 547, 563-64 (8th Cir. 2009) (relying on Arkansas law)
California	<i>Nat'l Auto. & Cas. Ins. Co. v. Payne</i> , 67 Cal. Rptr. 784, 788 (Ct. App. 1968)
Colorado	<i>Owens v. Brochner</i> , 172 Colo. 525 (1970)
Connecticut	<i>Champagne v. Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc.</i> , 562 A.2d 1100, 1110 (1989)
Delaware	<i>In re Asbestos Litig.</i> , 673 A.2d 159, 163 (Del. 1996)
Florida	<i>Copeland v. Armstrong Cork Co.</i> , 447 So. 2d 922, 927 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1984) <i>decision approved in part, quashed in part sub nom. Celotex Corp. v. Copeland</i> , 471 So. 2d 533 (Fla. 1985)
Georgia	<i>Sandy Springs Toyota v. Classic Cadillac Atlanta Corp.</i> , 269 Ga. App. 470, 472 (2004)
Hawaii	<i>Ass'n of Apartment Owners of Newtown Meadows ex rel. its Bd. of Directors v. Venture 15, Inc.</i> , 167 P.3d 225, 270 (2007)
Idaho	<i>Full Circle, Inc. v. Schelling</i> , 701 P.2d 254, 258 (Id. Ct. App. 1985)
Illinois	<i>Jackson Jordan, Inc. v. Leydig, Voit & Mayer</i> , 633 N.E.2d 627, 631 (Ill. 1994)
Indiana	<i>Burks v. Rushmore</i> , 534 N.E.2d 1101, 1104 (Ind. 1989)
Iowa	<i>Frideres v. Schiltz</i> , 540 N.W.2d 261, 267 (Iowa 1995)
Kansas	<i>Hall v. Miller</i> , 36 P.3d 328, 332 (2001)
Kentucky	<i>Lipsteuer v. CSX Transp., Inc.</i> , 37 S.W.3d 732, 737 (Ky. 2000)
Maine	<i>Brawn v. Oral Surgery Associates</i> , 819 A.2d 1014, 1025-26 (Me. 2003) (fraud is a mixed question of fact and law)
Maryland	<i>O'Hara v. Kovens</i> , 305 Md. 280, 294-95 (1986)
Massachusetts	<i>Taygeta Corp. v. Varian Associates, Inc.</i> , 763 N.E.2d 1053, 1063 (Mass. 2002)
Michigan	<i>Flynn v. McLouth Steel Corp.</i> , 223 N.W.2d 297, 301 (Mich. Ct. App. 1974)
Mississippi	<i>Jordan v. Emp. Transfer Corp.</i> , 509 So.2d 420, 423-24 (analysis is specific to whether, in light of plaintiff's own information and the diagnosis he received, the plaintiff was reasonable to delay filing suit, and thus inquiry must be on a case-by-case basis) <i>Stringer v. Trapp</i> , 30 So.3d 339, 342 (Miss. 2010)
Montana	<i>Johnson v. Berry</i> , 171 F. Supp. 2d 985, 990 (E.D. Mo. 2011) <i>Nelson v. Nelson</i> , 50 P.3d 139, 144 (Mont. 2002)
Nebraska	<i>Dutton-Lainson Co. v. Continental Ins. Co.</i> , 716 N.W.2d 87, 99 (Neb. 2006) (statute of limitations is only a question of law where facts are

	undisputed)
Nevada	<i>Klehr v. A.O. Smith Corp.</i> , 87 F.3d 231, 235 (8th Cir. 1996) aff'd, 521 U.S. 179, 117 S. Ct. 1984 (1997) <i>Bacon v. United Rd. Serv., Inc.</i> , 238 P.3d 794 (Nev. 2008)
New Hampshire	<i>Kelleher v. Marvin Lumber & Cedar Co.</i> , 891 A.2d 477, 487 (N.H. 2005)
New Jersey	<i>Lopez v. Swyer</i> , 300 A.2d 563, 566 (N.J. 1973)
New Mexico	<i>Williams v. Stewart</i> , 112 P.3d 281, 286 (N.M. 2005)
New York	<i>New York State Workers' Comp. Bd. v. Consol. Risk Servs., Inc.</i> , 125 A.D.3d 1250 (N.Y. App. Div. 2015)
North Carolina	<i>Lord v. Customized Consulting Specialty, Inc.</i> , 643 S.E.2d 28, 33 (N.C. App. 2007)
North Dakota	<i>Muhammed v. Welch</i> , 675 N.W.2d 402, 414 (N.D. 2004) (whether defendant is estopped from claiming statute of limitations defense is a fact question for a jury)
Ohio	<i>Cyrus v. Henes</i> , 623 N.E.2d 1256, 1258 (Oh. App. 1993) rev'd on other grounds, 640 N.E.2d 810 (1994)
Oklahoma	<i>Horton v. Hamilton</i> , 2015 OK 6, ¶ 10
Oregon	<i>Cole v. Sunnyside Marketplace, LLC</i> , 160 P.3d 1, 6 (Or. Ct. App. 2007)
Pennsylvania	<i>Fine v. Checcio</i> , 870 A.2d 850, 858-59 (Pa. 2005) <i>Esposito v. Novartis Pharm. Corp.</i> , -- F.Supp.2d --, 2015 WL 5474339, *6 (D.R.I. Sept. 18, 2015)
South Carolina	<i>Graham v. Welch, Roberts & Amburn, LLP</i> , 743 S.E.2d 860, 862-63 (S.C. Ct. App. 2013)
South Dakota	<i>Robinson v. Ewalt</i> , 808 N.W.2d 123, 126 (S.D. 2012)
Tennessee	<i>Wyatt v. A-Best, Co.</i> , 910 S.W.2d 851, 855 (Tenn. 1995)
Texas	<i>Hooks v. Samson Lone Star, Ltd. P'ship</i> , 457 S.W.3d 52, 55 (Tex. 2015) reh'g denied (May 1, 2015) (issue of reasonable diligence is a question of fact)
Utah	<i>Berenda v. Langford</i> , 914 P.2d 45, 54 (Utah 1996)
Vermont	<i>Ware v. Gifford Mem'l Hosp.</i> , 664 F. Supp. 169, 171 (D. Vt. 1987)
Virginia	<i>Louisville & N.R. Co. v. Saltzer</i> , 144 S.E. 456 (Va. 1928) (question of when a statute of limitations accrued is a question for a jury unless evidence is undisputed)
Washington	<i>Green v. A.P.C.</i> , 136 Wash.2d 87, 100 (1998)
West Virginia	<i>Dunn v. Rockwell</i> , 689 S.E.2d 255, 265 (W. Va. 2009)
Wisconsin	<i>Gumz v. N. States Power Co.</i> , 742 N.W.2d 271, 280 (Wis. 2007)
Wyoming	<i>DeLoge v. Homar</i> , 297 P.3d 117, 120 (Wyo. 2013) (when facts are disputed, statute of limitations is a fact question reserved for a jury)

5356430/26997-0001